DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 036 JC 790 043

AUTHOR Robinson, H. F.; And Others
TITLE Expanding Student Mobility: A Challenge for Community Colleges. Workshop Proceedings. (Asheville, North Carolina, November 7-9, 1977).
INSTITUTION Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 71p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; Administrator Role; *Articulation (Program); College Role; Counselor Role; Educational Mobility; Junior Colleges; *Postsecondary Education; *Student Mobility; Teaching Techniques; Technical Institutes; *Transfer Policy; Transfers; Universities
IDENTIFIERS Lateral Mobility; Vertical Mobility

ABSTRACT

The first of four presentations in this collection dealing with student mobility focuses on the role of the university in improving vertical mobility. Questions concerning the impact of community colleges on baccalaureate programs, the demand for vertical mobility, and means of improving mobility are addressed. Particular problems of Western Carolina University are discussed, and the success of the student development program in dealing with these problems is described. The second paper is concerned with student affairs services and the challenge felt by college counselors of increasing numbers of nontraditional students. The findings of a study on the role of counselors as perceived by administrators, faculty, and counselors themselves are presented. The third paper considers the role of management in student mobility in view of issues such as quantity vs. quality, comprehensiveness vs. single purpose, general education vs. specialization, and cooperation vs. competition. Also considered are ways of facilitating vertical and lateral mobility, and potential hindrances to be avoided. The implications for instructional affairs are discussed in the final paper which approaches student mobility in terms of student goals, student-directed learning, learning styles, program placement, faculty role, developmental programs, instructional models, curriculum development, institutional role, and state role. (MB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164036

EXPANDING STUDENT MOBILITY:

A Challenge for Community Colleges

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Southern Regional Education Board

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 790 043

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD

EXPANDING STUDENT MOBILITY:

A Challenge for Community Colleges

Workshop Proceedings
November 7-9, 1977
Asheville, North Carolina

Sponsored by

Southern Regional Education Board
130 Sixth Street, N. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

INTRODUCTION

The community colleges in the Southern region have directed much attention to the task of improving their services to the large body of non-traditional students who enroll. Particular focus has centered upon the needs of minority students whose pre-preparation left them with deficiencies that prevent immediate academic success. Focus has also been given to the matter of transfer programs. There is feeling among the minority students that they are being channeled into terminal programs rather than programs leading to the senior college. Faculty and staff development programs have been initiated in many of these institutions in an effort to remedy some of the problems. Workshops and conferences have also contributed to these efforts.

A recent monograph published by the Southern Regional Education Board highlights the importance of student mobility as a means to increase the opportunities for greater success of the community college student. The document, Lateral and Vertical Student Mobility, has received wide attention from institutions throughout the region. It has also served as a basis for a workshop sponsored by SREB for the Western North Carolina Consortium of Community Colleges.

This report includes the four major presentations at a workshop for the Western North Carolina Consortium. Participants included presidents, deans, other administrative personnel and faculty of the consortium institutions.

THE PRESENTATIONS

I. The Role of the University in Student Mobility

Dr. H. F. Robinson
Chancellor
Western Carolina University
Cullowhee, North Carolina 28723

II. Lateral and Vertical Student Mobility: Implications for Instructional Affairs

Dr. Katherine E. Hunter
Administrator for Program Development and Evaluation
Department of Community Colleges
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

III. Student Affairs-Alternative Roles

Mrs. Eleanor J. Gay
Coordinator
Equal Access/Equal Opportunity
Florida Junior College
Jacksonville, Florida 32202

IV. Role of Management in Student Mobility

Dr. Cecil L. Groves
President
Austin Community College
Austin, Texas 78768

C

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY IN STUDENT MOBILITY

INTRODUCTION

The community college system has been one of the most important and rapidly developing changes in higher education that has ever happened in the state of North Carolina. The vast development of these some 58 institutions occurring over a 12-14 year period has had a tremendous impact on the higher education picture in this state. Even so, it is very difficult for us to assess the importance of the development of this program on the junior-senior level enrollment at colleges and universities. Some questions seem in order here:

1. Has the development of the community colleges and technical institutes really resulted in more or fewer students finishing the four-year baccalaureate degree?
2. Is there a significant demand on the part of community college/technical institute students for a vertical mobility route with a wide range of curricular opportunities at the university level?
3. Assuming there is the need for transfer routes, what needs to be done to improve the mobility of the student from the community college/technical institute into the public supported universities?

Let us look at these questions for a moment.

Has the development of technical institutes and community colleges resulted in less of a demand for the bachelor degree?

There is no question but that the post-high school going rate has been increased by the development of the community colleges and technical institutes.

The provision of the readily available and close-at-hand opportunities for attending the two-year institutions, and, in the process, having the students prepare themselves for the world of work in the first two years of their post-high school education may have decreased the demand for the baccalaureate degree. When I say decreased, I mean decreased the demand relative to what it would have been had these institutions not existed. To be more specific, had these institutions not been available, many of the students now enrolled in these institutions could have been enrolled in the public-supported universities of the University System. I expect that possibly a larger fraction of the students might have gone on to the baccalaureate degree than is presently the case with our system of community colleges and technical institutes. This is not to say that the total enrollment in higher education would have increased without the Community College and Technical Institute System. Assuming there might have been more baccalaureate degree holders would not necessarily have meant more people would have been better educated, nor does it mean that as many people would have participated in post-high school education. I can't answer the question of the kind and extent of impact these institutions have had on our population, but I do think it deserves a great deal of attention. I suggest that it might be worth some major research to determine what effect the development of these institutions may have had on the students seeking the baccalaureate degree.

What is the demand by students from the two-year institutions for transferring to the four-year colleges and universities and seeking the baccalaureate degree? How great is the need for improving the upward mobility route for community college/ technical institute students? Is there a "number" need not being met?

This is a major question and of great importance to those of us in the universities. If we are to provide routes for mobility of the students to continue toward the baccalaureate degree, we must have better information on the need for such programs than appears to be available at this time.

Speaking in general, rather than in specifics for Western Carolina University, I contend that the question being raised is to identify the true demand or need for transfer programs to accommodate students from the community colleges and particularly the technical institutes not presently being served. We do not seem to have the hard and correct data that would give the senior institutions a clear picture of the additional needs and demands of the transfer students. Those of us who have been working to provide for opportunities for students to transfer from the community colleges and technical institutes have been somewhat disappointed in the results we have achieved to date in terms of students taking advantage of these opportunities. As I will indicate in later remarks, it could well be that the fault lies at the university and not with the students or with the community colleges and technical institutes. Be that as it may, the question remains as to what the unmet needs may be for the transfer students and what mobility routes are needed to enable students coming from the more technically oriented curriculum to continue on to the baccalaureate degree.

What really needs to be done that is not already being done to provide transfer opportunities and improvement to the mobility routes for students in the two-year institutions so that they may complete the baccalaureate degree?

I know that this is a difficult question, one which Cecil Patterson and his group on transfer of credit of the North Carolina Association of State Colleges and Universities have been working over a number of years. Some progress has been made by Dr. Patterson and the group with the senior institutions, both private and public, in order to find some answers that would be meaningful and would assist in removing any problems concerning mobility. About a year ago Dr. Patterson, as chairman of this transferability committee, came before our liaison committee which has representatives from senior public-supported institutions of the University System, community college/technical institutes and private institutions who meet together on a regular basis to discuss topics of common interest. After a lengthy discussion with Dr. Patterson our committee concluded that this transfer committee should continue with its work in order to try to improve the ease of vertical mobility of students among our institutions.

I don't think that we, in universities, have made any phenomenal progress toward solving the vertical mobility problem where difficulty is being experienced by transfer students from the community colleges and technical institutes.

The students who have been enrolled in the college transfer program from the outset, who have made good grades and who could have enrolled in any of our institutions of the University System may not have experienced great

difficulty in transferring. Neither will those of the future who are adequately prepared by having taken proper courses for transferring experience difficulty. I believe the problems are gradually being solved for the students completing the college transfer curricula, and there do not appear to be any major obstacles in the vertical movement of the well-prepared students as they enter into the institutions of the University System.

WHERE DOES THE PROBLEM LIE?

I expect the principal problem exists with those students of the two-year institutions who may have experienced some and possibly considerable difficulty in their work in the college transfer program. More importantly I expect the major problems are with those students who have been enrolled in technical institutes and are not following the college transfer program, then decide that they would like to continue their college education beyond the two-year institutions. These students have had trouble in the past and are likely to continue to have problems until we improve the techniques of evaluating what an individual knows rather than what courses they have taken when they present themselves to the university as transfer candidates. Again, I would emphasize that it is extremely important that we, at the university, have a better understanding of the magnitude of volume of these students that are interested in vertical mobility between the two-year institutions and the university. It is my belief that the numbers may be greater than we have experienced in terms of actual applications. We must somehow work harder and more effectively in the future than we have in the past in identifying these students with interests of continuing their education and in giving them information as to what is

available at the university. They need to be provided the methods and procedures they should follow in order to transfer to the university with least possible loss of credit.

WESTERN CAROLINA UNIVERSITY AND THE VERTICAL MOBILITY ISSUE

Western Carolina University has, since I came to the university, made a concerted effort to provide vertical mobility opportunities to students from technical institutes as well as community colleges, both from within and outside the college transfer program. We are endeavoring to provide opportunities for students to come to the university and continue their studies with a minimum loss of credit. The loss of credit should depend upon the record the individual has made at the community college or technical institute, the type of courses taken, and the advancement made in the educational program while enrolled at the two-year institutions. We should have, by now, standardized our procedures and have fairly well-developed policies on what and how much credit is allowed. You know of the contractual arrangements that we have developed and we still work on these procedures in order to improve the mobility of the students from the two-year institutions to Western Carolina University. However, we continue to face unsolved problems at the university with regard to transfer of students and I will mention only a few of these.

First, we have the organizational problem. The university has not necessarily been structured to accommodate and meet the needs of the transfer student. The governance and the administration of the institution as well as curriculum development at the departmental level, have been focused on the

students' commencing and finishing their academic career at the four-year institution. The system does not necessarily provide an opportunity for change in a rapid and effective manner in order to meet the needs of the transfer student. Faculty operate under a widely and extensively dispersed administrative structure in a manner which allows considerable freedom with regard to accepting or rejecting students and much personal authority is involved in accepting and accommodating the two-year transfer student.

Second, our communication system does not necessarily respond to or meet the needs of the transfer student. We have developed a system of communicating through the vice chancellors, the deans, the department heads, and finally the faculty members, largely centered around the conventional problems faced with the student who normally enrolls at the university and continues through the four-year degree. We need to make certain modifications as we seek to accommodate the needs of the transfer student, and while these changes are being made, they are somewhat slow in coming. Faculty members lack knowledge about the problems of the transfer student and, in many cases, they may have developed a bias toward these students which becomes apparent as they try to accommodate and find the solution to the problems of these students. Our counseling and advising does not always seek out and find the floundering transfer student who may, more likely than non-transfers, be a commuting student and have family and/or job responsibilities.

Third, is the general problem of quality assurance. A university faculty has responsibility to maintain a certain quality level of the work of students as they progress through the institution, and, finally, of the graduates of the

institution. Faculties take this responsibility very seriously, as they should, and we continue to hear the argument that the transfer student from the community colleges and technical institutes may, in certain cases, not be meeting the academic standards desired and should not have been admitted to the institution. A few faculty members appear to think this applies to all transfer students--that the quality of the senior institution suffers if accommodations are made for taking a number of transfer students in the various curricula. Whether or not faculty members are correct in this assumption (which I doubt) the fact remains that we have not experienced a large influx of students from the two-year curriculum and, therefore, any change in the quality of the institution cannot be a result of the transfer student. In many cases the quality of the institution might well be improved by the transfer student. We are going to have to wait until we have much more experience with students from the two-year institutions before we can finally arrive at an understanding of their effect on the overall student population of the senior institutions.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS FOR SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM

It is my belief that there is a definite failure on the part of those at the two-year institutions as well as at the four-year institutions in finding the solution to the mobility problem. Those of you at the two-year institutions have been critical of, and at times may have condemned, the actions of those of us at the university level without truly understanding the problems we face in accommodating the transfer students. At the university the faculty, and oftentimes the administrators, are unaware of the problems that exist at

the community colleges and technical institutes and lack knowledge of the caliber of the student who wishes to transfer from the non-college transfer program into the senior institution to continue academic work. It is this lack of understanding by those within each of our separate kinds of institutions that continues, and will continue, to cause the problem, unless we can establish better communication between our two kinds of institutions.

What I mean by establishing a better means of communication having a firsthand knowledge of not only what actually exists in the academic programs of the two different kinds of institutions, but also a closer working arrangement with the student who has expressed the desire to transfer to the senior institution. We must have a greater understanding of the capabilities of your students who come to us. We must know more of his or her state of advancement of education, and, in turn, the transfer student must be more fully cognizant of the opportunities at the university as well as the demands of the senior institutions on the transfer student once he decides to continue with his education.

We, at Western Carolina, are in the process of trying a new approach in improving the communications between our institutions. We are evaluating a model which, I believe, may be successful in the solution to the vertical mobility of our students coming from the two-year institutions. Professor Sara Montgomery, who has almost completed requirements for the doctorate in two-year institution administration, has joined Western Carolina University in charge of the transfer program.

As Mrs. Montgomery studies the university she will become familiar

with every department, with the faculty members who are the key to the success of the transfer student, and with all of our requirements. I know that she is viewing the institution much as a transfer student would, evaluating ways to assist the student first to receive the maximum amount of credit that is appropriately due him or her as the transfer is made, and second to insure that the student will be satisfied with his new academic home and can proceed uninterrupted with the work toward the baccalaureate degree. I know that Mrs. Montgomery is working hard on understanding all of the admission policies and practices, the reasons for these rules and regulations, and is giving particularly close scrutiny to that which may be causing special problems for the transfer.

There is another very important side of the work of Mrs. Montgomery and this relates to her work directly with you and your institutions. It has been my belief that if we are to be effective in working out the vertical movement problem, we must have a person who is fully cognizant of the two-year institutions and of the students who wish to transfer to the senior institutions. This person must move freely and frequently back and forth from the university to the two-year institutions and identify with these important institutions. The person in this position should be available on a pre-arranged schedule to visit with students who are interested in transferring to the universities. It is this continuing involvement with your institutions, the buildup of the communication system, having an understanding of the magnitude of the number of students interested in transferring, and the nature of the problems which these students are likely to encounter that will finally increase the vertical mobility of the students.

I have asked Mrs. Montgomery to give me suggestions in preparation for the remarks which I have made here and this she has done, and I am going to take one further advantage of her--that is to ask her if she will at this time give a brief synopsis of how she sees the problem from the standpoint of an individual who has come from the two-year institution and is now at the university level working on the transfer program.

SARA MONTGOMERY:

First of all, may I say it is a pleasure to have been appointed to a position which gives me the opportunity to work with two-year institutions to facilitate the transfer of students from one level of postsecondary education to another.

Ignored for years--transfers have become an increasingly important segment of new students. Four important social trends have placed emphasis on the importance of the transfer student. These are the declining birthrate, the receding rate of growth of college-age population, unprecedented inflation with the ensuing rise of tuition rate, and university projected attendance levels.

In the past, articulation has been delegated to admissions and records and registration processes. If resources were sparse, energy was directed toward these sustaining processes and articulation suffered. Colleges and universities have a public obligation to serve national, state and local interests. The universities' primary concern should not be to recruit a required number of bodies, but the offering of balanced programs which

consider present demand, future needs and long-term institutional stability.

In order to provide services for articulation, Western Carolina is concentrating in four areas of concern:

First, WCU has made articulation a priority. Articulation can only be realized by serious university commitment to cooperative endeavors, to sharing resources and to policy changes for the good of students and the public. There must be a well-organized system of interinstitutional cooperation and a well-defined role for the articulation specialist or coordinator for transfer programs. The major goal must be to facilitate the most beneficial transition of students from one educational level to another so that they encounter no unnecessary barrier in admission to another institution and lose no unnecessary time or credit.

The second concern is that the university be properly organized for the task of articulation. Articulation services at WCU are organized as a free-standing entity equal to other student services. The office of articulation specialist is held responsible for effectively improving student transfer. This same office has been given adequate administrative support in the form of staff, funds and authority. To be more specific, the transfer office is providing research, literature and pre-admission counseling in the form of program selection, credit transfer and academic and social adjustment. It is working for the student's benefit with university admissions, financial aid, counseling services, deans and faculty.

The third concern is the organization of interinstitutional communication. This office should do more than seek out, organize and distribute college information; it should become actually involved with two-year institutions in the development of admissions and articulation policy. The articulation function should be extricated from subordination to either the two-year institution counseling and guidance programs or university admissions offices.

The fourth concern is the recognition of the need for good relations between two and four-year institutions. There must be continuous feedback and communications with a continuous evaluation of the effects of admission policies and articulation. The climate must be improved to improve student transition.

I see the role of coordinator of transfer programs to be involvement in diverse activities which affect the transfer student. First, there is the identification and advising of prospective transfers. This includes planned trips to two-year institutions and the opportunity to talk with students--and visits of prospective transfers to the four-year institutions. Transmittal of informational literature and direct personalized correspondence will be necessary. Secondly, there must be academic advising for the transfer student in order that best use can be made of the transfer's previously earned credit. This includes communication with academic departments on the university campus to better inform them of the transfer student's capabilities and to extend more opportunities for earned credit.

Another role is the development of adequate sources of financial support for transfers to give them financial aid parity in competition for funds with beginning freshmen.

Fourth is the coordination and communication within the university and with the two-year institutions. Next is the authority to make recommendations to university decision-making bodies about policies for transfers. Sixth, is the assistance in admissions processes and in the evaluation of transcripts. At WCU, specific counseling manuals for prospective transfer students are being developed along with course equivalence guides. And last, is the planning of specific orientation programs for transfer students.

As you can see, the office for transfer is a multi-faceted position. It spans the whole spectrum of articulation between the two-year institutions and colleges and universities. It is not without problems--problems of long standing and even some of tradition. One of the major problems seems to be identifying the perspective transfer. Who is he or she? How may we serve his or her needs? Interest in articulation should not rise and subside to meet enrollment or public relations crises--it needs to be comprehensive, consistent and long-range.

STUDENT AFFAIRS - ALTERNATIVE ROLES

The theme for my remarks is "Student Affairs - Alternative Roles". I need to tell you that I will use the term student affairs and student development interchangeably. I am far more comfortable with the term student development for several reasons. The foremost reason is that, in my mind, student development is a more meaningful term with which to designate those services generally assigned to student personnel workers. Secondly, we use the term in the setting in which I work, and I speak largely from the perspective of that setting.

The major assumption of this paper is that total student development has been, and must remain, one of the primary goals of the community college. Most community college goal statements include intentions to promote in students independence of thought along with critical thinking; to make students better citizens as well as to make them more knowledgeable about their cultural heritage; and to help students understand themselves and relate better with others as well as to prepare them for transition to work or to an upper-level institution. In simple truth most community colleges really try to accomplish those goals, but how they seek to accomplish them deserves critical scrutiny. In far too many instances, traditional techniques are employed to deliver instruction and services to nontraditional students. Is it any wonder that we are assembled here to try to find ways to enhance student mobility in the community college?

The college experience has been viewed by student development staff as a total one, with out-of-class activities and experiences as an essential part of that total. There are really two assumptions here that need to be questioned. First, is the student affairs staff the only personnel on campus concerned about student development? The answer is obvious, but it seldom results in asking the next question. Can student development really be fostered effectively without the support and influence of the total college population--administrators, faculty, counselors, librarians, other professionals, clerical staff and students?

The community college has rapidly gained the reputation of being that segment of postsecondary education which cares about the personal as well as the academic development of individuals. The multifaceted program of the community college attracts, and hopefully nourishes and develops, a uniquely diverse mixture of people. It is flexible enough to include students that are high school graduates, high school drop-outs, housewives who return to education, displaced homemakers forced to return to school to learn or to upgrade a skill, and senior citizens who feel that education is not merely for the young but for the living. The needs of such a diverse student population demand that the community college consider alternative delivery systems and new ways of accomplishing traditional educational objectives.

The challenge to the community college is not only how to cope with large numbers of students from low social and economic backgrounds with marginal or non-existent basic skills, though that remains a formidable task. The real

challenge lies in trying to accomplish the same kind of postsecondary education goals with different kinds of students. The latter challenge is one which must be accepted by the total staff.

Historically, postsecondary institutions have tended to assign maintenance functions and responsibility for the development of the affective domain to student affairs, and responsibility for cognitive development to academic faculty.

In hindsight, it is possible to say that the community college chose a deadend course when it embraced primarily the same role and function for its student affairs personnel.

New students demand new ways of doing things. The student affairs staff and the academic staff can no longer departmentalize their efforts to facilitate student mobility. The needs and rights of the community college student will not permit fragmentation of services. The student development staff must have some impact on what happens in the classroom, and the faculty must have some impact on what happens in the counseling cubicle, in the financial aid office, and in decisions relating to the student's out-of-class experiences. Today's society is much more inclined to see cognitive and affective growth as intimately related. It seems to me that the community college is the institution best able to demonstrate the accuracy of such a concept.

Further, I view the student affairs personnel, particularly the counselors, as the persons most responsible for taking the risk necessary to influence and

initiate, if necessary, ways of delivering instruction and services which treat the development of the affective domain as more than a byproduct of the educational process.

In their present capacities student affairs workers are clearly providing services, needed services, which contribute to student mobility; but whether or not some of the mundane tasks necessary to the services now rendered are a wise use of the skills and talents of counselors and other specialists in student affairs is another question.

There is evidence in the literature and in conferences such as this that suggests that the community college, along with other postsecondary institutions, is aware of the need for a new role for student affairs personnel in the educational process. There is reason to hope that the emerging awareness of a need for change in the use of the resources in student affairs is accompanied by the willingness to change. This trend deserves encouragement and implies that student personnel professionals who wish to have significant input and influence on student mobility patterns of the future are going to have to revise their own self-perceptions and the perceptions that others have of them.

While student personnel workers have professed themselves to be educators and to be interested in the whole student, they have served essentially as housekeepers, guardians of the status quo, and have been seen by many in the postsecondary education arena as petty administrators or "those people who sit in their offices and give warm strokes to students who complain about the system, particularly the teacher."

The most profound reason for those professionally concerned about student development, i.e., student personnel workers, to seek a new role is for the better fulfillment of their espoused goal of developing the whole student. Whether the traditional student affairs functions were pushed out of academia, handed over innocently, or picked up by default, makes little difference; what matters at this point in time is that serious thought be given to alternative roles. Operationally, some student personnel workers have taken up the challenge, become specialists, and are demanding equal recognition in the academic world.

It is time for student personnel workers to recognize that they too have been dealing with only a part of the student and it is no more valid for them to expect effectiveness in dealing with the student's development, independent of his academic life, than it is for the teacher to think a student's personal self does not affect his academic growth. To have an impact on student mobility means being aware of, and involved in, the total environment of the student—not just where he lives, or what high school he graduated from, what cumulative grade point average he has, what organization he belongs to, or what career objectives he has. Obviously, such information is necessary. It is particularly important to know something about, and be sensitive to, the "off-campus world" of the minority student. The kinds of factors which influence the behaviors of students from the urban core environment differ markedly from those of the middle and upper middle class neighborhoods. The most significant part of the student's in-school environment is the classroom. Student personnel workers who would contribute effectively to student mobility must somehow impact the classroom climate.

If student personnel workers have no part in what happens in the classroom, they cannot realistically measure the results of their efforts on student development; nor can administrators really expect student personnel staffs, especially counselors, to be accountable. If we agree that the student personnel worker needs a new role and if registration, orientation, advising and good guy models are no longer effective or appropriate, if they ever were, what are some possible alternative roles?

A review of the research literature related to the role and function of student personnel professionals in the community college setting leaves me with these impressions: First, the emphasis is on change from rehabilitative functions to facilitative functions; second, student personnel workers are no longer passive, they are active; third, student personnel workers are no longer the interpreters of institutional philosophy, they are organizing their resources to change and direct institutional philosophy.

Terry O'Banion in a paper titled The Student Development Model-How Does It Work stated, and I quote:

> Student personnel work is no longer rehabilitative, tending the lame. Personnel work is facilitative, turning on the bored, bright and beautiful. We have moved from a rehabilitative function, the old medical model that many of us were involved in, to a new model of facilitating student development. The emphasis has changed from psychoanalytic and behavioristic theory to existential and humanistic theory.

O'Banion also noted that:

> Student personnel work is no longer passive; student personnel work has become active. Student personnel work is no longer only a series of services for students who wish to use those services. Student personnel work is an action oriented program

that encounters, facilitates and intervenes. The counselor is no longer a therapist reflecting in his cubicle. He is a social activist working with students and faculty in the cafeteria and on the street corner.

FINDINGS OF A STUDY ON THE ROLE OF COUNSELORS

Findings by Hadwin (1975) in a major applied research project help us to understand some of the conflicts felt by counselors and other personnel as they experienced and evaluated traditional and nontraditional functions.

The Hadwin study investigated the way in which a campus staff of a multi-campus urban community college perceived the roles of its counselors. Specific emphasis was given to the traditional work roles of counselors, and to their involvement as change agents in a staff development program.

The subjects were 100 employees of Florida Junior College at Jacksonville. They included persons from six work groups: administration, career employees, academic faculty, career education faculty, student development staff (not including counselors), and counselors.

An interview was obtained with each subject. These sessions, ranging in time from 25 to 95 minutes, were structured through the use of eight interview questions relating to a counselor's role. Subjects' responses were categorized and analyzed according to work groups.

The findings were summarized for each of the six work groups comprising the sample. Time will not permit me to detail the findings in each group, but let us look at the perceptions of the administrator, faculty and counselors.

Administrators

Administrators (Hadwin 1975, pp. 98-104) believed that counselors should be more effective and devote full-time to functions which focused on the student's entry into the system, primarily registration, orientation, and advising. Administrators believed that the most important thing counselors had done in the area of staff development was a retreat, The North Campus Family Tree. An interesting finding is another attitude, a belief that counselors were too involved in the staff development area, despite the agreement that the retreat was helpful and well done, and that counselor-staff conferences were profitable.

Thus, administrators were confused by the dual role of counselors who were effective in traditional and nontraditional areas. This confusion left them with a double message for the interviewer which was interpreted: "Look, the familiar is needed and is your job. Be cautious with the new stuff; and yet, it looks so good!"

Faculty

The academic faculty's report of the work role of counselors was broad, vaguely defined, and contained several unmet expectations. One major expectation was related to testing and placement of students, an area in which the faculty wanted counselors to be more effective. While they encouraged counselors to improve their performance in such activities, they reported that one of the two must important contributions counselors had made was their involvement in testing and career guidance. The academic faculty's other choice for

the most important contribution was the counselors' work with faculty and staff.

Career education faculty thought, as did the academic faculty, that counselor involvement in testing, career guidance, and working with faculty and staff were the most important things that counselors had done. They did not know of any specific area in which counselors could be more effective. More than half of the career education faculty had worked with counselors who were assigned to their area. They encouraged counselors to give even more emphasis to working with faculty and staff.

Counselors

Counselors believed that they were engaged in full-time registration, orientation and advisory functions. They stated that they could not be more effective in those areas, and did not feel that it was important for community college counselors to orient and advise students.

Counselors considered it a major responsibility to work with faculty and staff, and thought it to be the most important thing which they had done. They wanted to improve their work in this area, as well as in personal counseling and career guidance. They wanted to interact with staff in order to inform them about the work which they were doing rather than use brochures and reports to accomplish this goal.

General Findings

All the groups interviewed thought that counselors should be doing more

personal counseling. This implies that community college personnel were aware of the needs of the students who live in problem-laden environments. Another implication was that the image of the irrelevant professional counselor was fading, and that the availability of trained personnel was being recognized and appreciated.

It is not the intention of this paper to specify alternative roles for student affairs personnel. However, having gone this far in suggesting the need for a new concept of student development and a new role for personnel workers, especially counselors, I am compelled to at least suggest some of the major ingredients which might make up this new role.

ATTITUDINAL CHANGE

The new role will necessitate a change in at least two attitudinal stances which have been implicit, if not explicit, in role definitions in the past. First, there has to be a recognition that student personnel workers are not the only individuals on campus who are concerned about total student development. Second, student personnel workers are going to have to abandon any behavior patterns that border on paternalistic concern for students. If others on campus are also concerned about student development, then counselors should align themselves with these groups and seek to have an impact upon the total academic community. This new role should be one that does not function primarily as an adversary of the faculty and administration nor as an ally of the students, but rather as an equal partner who seeks the attainment of the college's ultimate goals.

INVOLVEMENT IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

It is time now for student development functions to become curricular, with no prefix added. This means legitimatizing current out-of-class experiences by making them available more systematically to all students and by giving them some type of academic recognition. It also means that student development concepts, if not student personnel workers, should permeate the academic offerings and have an impact on not only what is taught, but how it is taught.

This means membership on curriculum committees and meetings with instructional divisions to discuss and influence curricular reforms. It means proposing new courses and new programs. Until student development concepts and programs are fully integrated with the academic program and until faculty and counselors adopt a team approach in and out of the classroom, total student development will be a notion, not a reality.

DIRECT CONTACT WITH EVERY STUDENT

Student development programs and student affairs functions must directly affect each student in the institution. Without inhibiting freedom of choice by students, efforts should be made to assure that they are informed of the possible consequences of their choice and they must have the opportunity to examine alternative choices.

There is nothing magical about the new roles suggested. Many community colleges around the country have implemented new and exciting student development programs. The positive results of such programs are quite well known.

One of the most outstanding innovative activities that is going on in the community college is the decentralization of counselors. At Miami-Dade in Miami, Florida some counselors are doing curbstone counseling. At Santa Fe Community College in Gainesville, Florida counselors are working with faculty in science and team teaching courses in personal development.

At my own college counselors are housed in unassigned program areas with faculty and students three to four days per week. There they function as consultants to the faculty, relate in a very personal way to the students in the area, and perform special services, such as testing, academic advising, group counseling, and faculty in-service training. The counselors attend the faculty meetings and interact with faculty on committee assignments. The arrangement is very effective, and influences the retention and mobility of students.

Finally, the activities which characterize student development programs that facilitate lateral and upward mobility of students will differ from one place to another because of different needs. However, one characteristic is common, i.e., people--people who care about students and let them know it, people who are willing to approach and deal with students with respect, people who treat students as individuals with special needs and aspirations, and people who are willing to take risks, and to assume responsibility for the personal adjustments necessary to create an environment where each student is given the support he needs to accomplish his educational objectives.

REFERENCES

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Less time, more options. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Grant, W. Harold. "A student development point of view of education." A proposal presented and accepted by the Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education, October, 1971.

Hoyt, Donald P., "APGA: Cherish or perish?" Personnel and Guidance Journal. February, 1971, 49, 431-438.

O'Banion, Terry. New directions in community student personnel programs. Student Personnel Series, No. 15, Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association, 1971.

ROLE OF MANAGEMENT IN STUDENT MOBILITY

Management has many definitions, some of which may be, to varying degrees, applicable and appropriate to us. For our purpose, we need to consider primarily constructive interaction between persons, places, things, and programs for the purpose of accomplishing previously established goals and objectives in the most efficient and effective manner possible. Phrased in terms of student mobility, a definition of management might read, "The relationship between persons, places, things, and program designed to promote, enhance, and facilitate the constructive vertical and lateral mobility of students."

The primary purposes of this paper are four-fold: First, some of the major issues confronting the matter of student mobility both directly and indirectly are identified. Second, several steps which may be taken to facilitate student mobility are presented. Third, a few areas of concern which may hinder student mobility are examined. Finally, a model is offered to develop a comprehensive mobility plan. Little of this may be new; however, it is hoped that this presentation may bring us to a new level of awareness in the area of student mobility and its associated factors.

A primary assumption of this presentation is that student mobility does not just happen naturally; in fact, there exist several forces in direct opposition to the concept. Concerted, concentrated, and continuing attention by all personnel, and by management in particular, is required for student mobility to occur.

In the following section some of the major issues confronting higher education are identified and their direct or indirect relationship to student mobility examined. Once identified, these issues provide a promising stimulus for later discussion.

ISSUES RELATED TO STUDENT MOBILITY

Quantity vs. Quality

This issue is a thorny one which has captured national attention. Recently, Change magazine published a book on the future of higher education in which was assembled a collection of essays by leading educators concerning higher education going into the 21st century. One of the major issues concerned academic excellence or quality and whether or not it can be maintained with the open-door philosophy. Most of us would answer affirmatively that you can have quantity and quality; however, we may quickly add that it is becoming increasingly more difficult. While quantity and quality may not necessarily be mutually exclusive terms, they do relate differently to student mobility. Quantity addresses, through the open-door philosophy, the matter of equal access to education and subsequent opportunity for mobility, particularly lateral mobility. Quality more directly addresses the matter of vertical mobility and the assurance of transfer.

Comprehensiveness vs. Single Purpose

This issue is related to the previous one. Can a two-year college be all things to all people? Should the role, scope, and mission be restricted and specialization emphasized? We probably, as a group, strongly endorse

comprehensiveness as one of our major goals; yet, recent limitations in funding and a leveling off of enrollments have dampened our spirits. Many states are now in the long and difficult process of developing statewide master plans to specifically address this issue. Lateral student mobility is certainly directly affected by whether or not the institution is comprehensive in its curricula.

General Education vs. Specialization

This issue represents an historic dilemma for education at all levels. The emphasis upon one or the other seems to come and go with each decade. Regional accrediting groups, such as the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, have recently lessened their emphasis upon specific (percentage quotas) requirements for general education in occupational curricula, allowing the institutions more latitude. On the other hand, specialized accrediting bodies have become more numerous and restrictive in their course requirements, allowing less latitude. Such bodies include the National League of Nursing, American Medical Association, Federal Aviation Authority, and Engineering Council on Professional Development. The opportunities and emphasis upon core curricula appear to have lessened in the past few years. As you may surmise, student mobility laterally is greatly restricted by increased specialization, while vertical mobility may be positively affected.

Cooperation vs. Competition

In recent years--the late 1960s and early 1970s--the emphasis upon inter-institutional cooperation has accelerated greatly with many exemplary efforts

undertaken in nearly all states. These initial efforts were mostly voluntary, being promoted by agencies such as the Southern Regional Education Board and congressional acts such as Title III--Developing Institutions Act--of the Higher Education Act. Recently, court and state mandated affiliations and associations have occurred as the result of litigation and legislative action. In terms of student mobility, this offers perhaps the most potential for both lateral and vertical movement.

FACILITATING STUDENT MOBILITY

There are two basic kinds of student mobility being considered - lateral and vertical. The question to ask yourselves is: What can management do to promote vertical and lateral student mobility?

Lateral Mobility

Intra-institutional mobility. Colleges must first internally address the problem of transfer between programs before they can effectively deal externally with the matter. Our policies and procedures frequently serve to limit or even prohibit lateral transfer, considering it indicative of failure. Counseling and advisement can do a great deal to facilitate lateral movement and mediate the negative effects.

Interdisciplinary programs. There needs to be more frequent and meaningful interaction between program areas, disciplines, departments, and divisions. Few developments could be more salutary than an interdisciplinary program shared between one of the general education program/departmental areas

and an occupational program area. If areas/departments within the college lack mutual respect for one another, how can students be expected to feel differently? What is so wrong in transferring from philosophy to plumbing or vice versa? If there is something wrong, maybe neither our pipes nor our theories hold water.

Electives. There always seems to be a pressure to eliminate electives in favor of specialization. This has already been discussed earlier under the heading of "General Education vs. Specialization." Electives are a key component to lateral and vertical mobility in several areas.

Policies and procedures. Many of our policies and procedures hinder rather than assist mobility because they were transplants from senior models or holdovers from the "junior college" era. Probation and suspension policies frequently make no provisions for lateral mobility such as transfer to another program. Policies and procedures should be established to facilitate rather than limit mobility. Too often, mobility is seen as a fault or dysfunction of the system, rather than a strength.

Competency-based education. This approach to curricula and instruction can do much to facilitate both vertical and lateral mobility by its identification of educational outcomes and the resultant ability to place students according to competence. Intra-institutionally this can be very effective so long as all departments and divisions participate. Interinstitutionally, it requires that, to be most effective, receiving and sending institutions adopt a comparable competence format.

Vertical Mobility

Joint degree programs. This is one of the most promising innovations to occur between two-year institutions and senior institutions. For some, the effort is one of survival in the search for new students; others see it as a means of enrichment through guaranteed vertical mobility. Typically, private four-year institutions have been the first to cooperate. Agreements between two-year and four-year colleges are usually based on one program at a time with separate agreements negotiated for each additional program.

Senior college articulation. This is very similar to the preceding and mainly emphasizes an ongoing relationship with senior colleges and universities. Often articulation takes the form of a written agreement or an annual meeting to negotiate courses.

Other areas of vertical mobility. Too often we forget about other groups, bodies, or agencies where students may desire to go after they leave our college. These include such areas as apprenticeship programs (union and non-union), professional and service groups, and social agencies. Apprenticeship programs will often allow advanced placement of two or more years toward apprenticeship for two-year college graduates. Other groups may allow the opportunity to sit for licensure or certification. The point is that vertical mobility does not always mean transfer to a senior college.

Going the other way. We've considered vertical mobility from the standpoint of its upward thrust. What about its downward role? Two-year colleges must address the upward mobility needs of students in high schools, vocational-technical schools, skill centers, CETA programs, public service jobs,

proprietary schools, and industrial training programs, to mention a few. If we desire fair treatment for our students by senior colleges, why shouldn't we extend that courtesy to those who look to us as the next rung on the career or educational ladder?

Reverse transfers. Increasingly the two-year college is the recipient of students transferring from senior institutions. This phenomenon suggests that we may need to deal especially with this matter through specialized counseling and services to assist the reverse transfer student. Also there is a need to examine our policies for acceptance of transfer students rather than denial of admission.

POTENTIAL HINDRANCES TO STUDENT MOBILITY

Vested Interests

Every institution has its vested interests; there are those who are arch defenders of the status quo. In terms of teaching faculty, these may be persons strongly oriented to their academic disciplines or professions. They often are the best teachers who take a personal interest in the student. You probably are asking yourself, "What is so bad about that?" The problem is that too often they are the most ardent advocates of specialization and tend to discourage any generic or core curricula. They are rarly concerned about lateral mobility and tend to focus upon having their students follow in foot-paths like theirs. These folks tend to oppose change as threat to their areas of concern. This same argument is equally true of their administrative counterparts.

Unidimensional Thinking

Management needs to nurture flexibility in thinking, looking in all directions. To concentrate on vertical mobility at the expense of lateral mobility or vice versa is a mistake. We need to consider mobility in its generic sense as a desirable goal institutionally.

Bucket Committee

Every institution has its bucket committee. This is an *ad hoc* association of persons who come together for the purpose of throwing cold water on any new ideas being promoted. Usually the bucket committee is composed mostly of those who have vested interests. In terms of policies that might promote student mobility or, for that matter, most anything, the bucket committee members can be heard collectively and individually to respond:

"It won't work in our situation."

"We tried that before."

"It's too radical a change."

"That will make our system obsolete."

"We've never done that before."

"It will affect our accreditation."

"What about our standards?"

"Why change--it's still working."

Communication

We too frequently rely upon "educationese" to explain relatively simple

concepts. Our communications have not been kept as clear and clean as should be. Also, the gravity theory is in operation. That is, communication flows downward but not upward. To flow upward, structures have to be established to carry it to the top.

Committees

Committees can be a cure as well as a curse for the resolution of institutional problems. Vested interests often play a role in committees. There are those who have been on the committee forever, it seems, and see their assignment as permanent. This is both good and bad. It's good from the standpoint of their interests but bad from the ownership and possessiveness they often express. Committees can effectively promote policies and procedures in need of change; but, they also may be the staunchest defenders of the status quo.

Red Tape

We too often take the position that it's good to cut red tape as long as we do it lengthwise. "Paper hurdles" and the "signature chase" are great hindrances to mobility. Imagine the confusion of the poor freshman who is confronted with problems of getting dozens of signatures--from the janitor to the president--before he can transfer from one program to another. We might refer to this as the registrar mentality where the efficacy of the transaction is measured in terms of signature and carbon copies. This is a little like winning the battle but losing the war.

STUDENT MOBILITY: SOME CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

So far we've looked at major issues confronting higher education and student mobility, made some suggestions for action, and pointed out some potential hindrances.

This conference has taken the first essential step, and that is to raise to consciousness level the matter of vertical and lateral mobility of two-year college students. Where we go from here is the next step. That step probably, from what has been said, is already underway, and that is the establishment of a data base so that it may be determined just where we are. Are two-year college students transferring to four-year colleges and in what numbers? Do students exercise the opportunity that exists for lateral mobility? These are just some of the questions which need answers.

Once the institution is aware of its needs for institutional mobility, then a commitment should be made institutionwide to address the problem. The institutional nature of this matter might well be reflected in the very role, scope, and mission of the college which may be in need of revision. Assuming the commitment is made, an identification of the barriers to mobility should occur and an appropriate strategy for addressing the problem developed.

While the preceding steps represent nothing new in institutional problem-solving, they need to be reviewed occasionally. One final step not mentioned, but necessary, is the summative evaluation of the process and product.

In conclusion, student mobility, both lateral and vertical, is as much an environmental and attitudinal matter as it is a collection of policies, procedures, and programs. Management must assure that the overall institutional commitment remains viable and visible.

LATERAL AND VERTICAL STUDENT MOBILITY: IMPLICATIONS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL AFFAIRS

INTRODUCTION

Mobility is a word frequently used in American society. Statistics are collected, analyzed and often quoted referring to the number of times we move--from one location to another, from one job to another, from one marriage partner to another, from one school to another, from one program of study to another. Mobility (moving) is a way of life for many of us. There is generally a positive feeling about the term mobility; it implies freedom--freedom of choice, freedom of movement, advancement, challenge and growth. Lack of mobility implies limitations--restrictions on choice, selection, movement, advancement, possibly stagnation.

"Mobility" as it relates to students is so important that the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) has published a monograph on the subject, Lateral and Vertical Student Mobility-An Essential for the Community College. (It is essential for other colleges and universities also.)

Educational leaders in North Carolina have determined it an important enough issue to have developed, in conjunction with SREB, this workshop emphasizing the role of instructional affairs, student affairs, the university, institutional management, and institutional affirmative action in moving students laterally and vertically in postsecondary institutions.

My remarks will just be a start in examining the role of instructional affairs in "lateral and vertical student mobility." Our discussion time in small groups will be essential in continuing the process of determining this role.

What I hope can be accomplished is that each person present will consider the role of instructional affairs in this whole process of student mobility--the barriers we build to stop students' progression from course to course, program to program, institution to institution, institution to job. The following then will be the objectives of this presentation:

1) To identify factors in instructional affairs that contribute to lateral and vertical mobility of students, and to relate these factors to students, faculty, programs, the institution, and the state;

2) To discuss how these factors can effectively provide for lateral and vertical student mobility.

STUDENTS

Let's start with the student. What are some barriers to mobility in the instructional area that relate directly to students?

1) The students' lack of competence to set or to reassess their goals--educational, career, and personal;

2) The students' lack of competence to be self-directed in learning, problem solving;

3) Lack of knowledge concerning students' learning styles;

4) Students' lack of ability to make realistic program choices.

Student Goals

What does goal setting have to do with student mobility? Well, obviously, if students have not identified educational goals and career goals, there is little opportunity for lateral and vertical mobility.

The ability and opportunity to reassess goals is as important as the ability to set goals. At every registration period we are faced with students moving from one program to another. At a recent meeting of the Florida Association of Community Colleges, a faculty member stated she had been sent a roster of students in her program and, of some 30 students, she recognized only two as still being active in the program. We (Florida State Department) find in gathering information on students enrolled in programs that the colleges find it difficult to keep up with program changers. If students were required to reassess their career and educational goals twice a year, prior to new registration dates, it is highly likely that problems related to changes in curriculum could be minimized.

The Division of Community Colleges in Florida has been interested in student goal setting for a number of reasons.

1) We have found, through the collection of placement and follow-up evaluation information, that a large number of students are undecided, and may continue to resist setting goals semester after

semester. Mechanisms to set or reassess goals are needed on the campus for students changing programs on a frequent basis.

2) We know that many students have goals other than job or degree goals. These are legitimate goals, such as upgrading job skills, obtaining sufficient competencies in certain areas so that the student can obtain a job without completing a degree, or gaining competencies in social interaction, communication, enhancement of self-concept or self-knowledge.

Yet, too often, the legislature and taxpayer see productivity in terms of degree or job placement. We need to identify other goals students have in attending colleges and follow-up on the students' success in reaching these goals.

The Division set up a committee of representatives from the colleges to look at the area of student goals and devise a catalog for use by students, faculty, administrators, counselors and perhaps, eventually, the legislature. The catalog lists six broad categories of goals--Career Development, Personal Development, Social Development, Academic Development, Cultural Development, Community Development--and then several more specific goals under these broad statements.

For example, under Career Development there are specific statements, such as "to determine a career goal, to develop management/leadership skills, to take a course to keep current in my field"; under Personal Development, "to understand myself better, to focus on my personal growth, to focus on my independence."

We believe the instrument can be used by students to set and reassess goals, by counselors in assisting students in planning how to meet their goals, by faculty in planning and modifying curriculum, and by administrators in demonstrating accountability.

Such goal setting activity can help bring program or curriculum goals and student goals closer together. Let me illustrate by saying that, in reviewing placement information recently, we discovered a program with "no completers" over a period of several years. Everyone left the program before obtaining a degree because they could obtain employment. The problem was not with program content, but with program length. One of the program goals was to offer a two-year degree; the student goals were to stay in the program long enough to get a job, which was a year. The institution now offers a certificate after one year of training in order to meet student goals and employer needs.

Self-directed Learning

Abilities to be self-directed can increase the student's opportunities for both lateral and vertical mobility. A self-directed student knows how to solve problems, acquire information, make decisions, develop study skills, learn about self, seek employment, and plan strategies for meeting goals. All of these capabilities help students move through courses and programs and reach goals. Students who can do things for themselves, who are independent and self-directed, can do what is necessary to be mobile.

The ability to become self-directed can be developed in a joint effort between instructional programs and student development/student affairs programs.

Learning Styles

Students learn and process information in different ways. The formidable task is to identify these various styles in a manner that will have meaning in the classroom and to then develop instructional strategies for dealing with individual style. You may wish to review a summary of learning and teaching styles and their respective implications for classroom application as discussed in Findings (1974), a bulletin published by Educational Testing Service.

One of the "breakthroughs" facilitating student mobility is the work Dr. Joe Hill has been doing for a decade in the area of cognitive style mappings. Though used around the country from kindergarten to graduate school, cognitive style mapping has been most widely used in community colleges in both developmental studies and regular classes. It is a diagnostic tool for testing, then charting or mapping the information gained. This interpretative information is shared with each student and a contract is developed that moves the student into a learning format and environment best suited for him, based on his individual cognitive style.

An absolute necessity for implementing cognitive style mapping is faculty and staff development. Faculty (and the paraprofessionals, counselors,

librarians, and media production personnel supporting them) must have a clear understanding of the concepts and must gain experience in adapting their teaching or counseling styles to the broad array of cognitive styles represented in their classes. They must adapt their materials, their methods and, in some cases, their traditional roles to become planners, producers of materials, and facilitators. Some of the things Patricia Cross and Carl Rogers and others have been saying about "the new students" and "teachers' roles as facilitators" all come together in using cognitive style mappings.

There are some outstanding examples of such programs around the country. We are particularly proud of the W.A.G.S. program at Polk Community College in Florida, and there are such programs here in North Carolina.

Program Placement

Program placement, a key factor in student mobility, involves having adequate information, or diagnostic tools to obtain necessary information, so that students can make realistic program choices, the need for remedial work can be determined, and placement can be made in courses or programs where the instructional method corresponds with the student's learning style.

FACULTY

Now let's discuss how the faculty fits into the role of instruction in student mobility. (What is said about faculty can be applied to counselors, learning resource personnel and paraprofessionals, since all of these people influence student mobility.)

Attitudes and philosophy of faculty can influence their interest and willingness to help students move through programs. In community colleges we often ask applicants if they understand and are committed to the "open door policy"--it is easy to say "yes" to this question and yet demonstrate an uncaring attitude toward students or be unconcerned about their goals and needs. Faculty may have a different set of expectations for "minority" students in terms of academic ability and potential success. Such expectations may influence student motivation and self-concept. Faculty should be aware of their own teaching style and how that relates to the learning style of their students. However, matching teaching and learning styles will not be of much help to students if the instructor is harsh, rejecting and inequitable.

In the age of faculty "retrenchment", staff development is essential. In Florida two percent of the state funding for community colleges is "earmarked" for staff and program development. It cannot be used for any other category nor can it be returned to general funds at the end of the year. Some colleges in Florida are interested in the competencies faculty (and other staff) need to do their job, and are using these competencies as a basis for evaluation and staff development. Institutions should consider what competencies faculty need for promoting student mobility and then provide staff development programs that will meet these needs.

Educators are pointing to the changing role of faculty from that of disseminator of curriculum content to facilitator of student learning. Additional competencies are going to be needed by faculty to fulfill this role.

It will be difficult for such changes to occur without a determination of what faculty need to be able to do, an evaluation process to determine if they do have needed competencies and then a "staff development" or "growth model" for faculty to obtain such competencies.

PROGRAMS

What are some barriers to student mobility in the area of programs?

1) Criteria for limited access programs may eliminate minority students;
2) Each student must complete programs within the same time frame;
3) There are no mechanisms for assessing prior learning or experiences or giving credit for these;
4) No attempt has been made for articulation between programs within and without the institution;
5) No consideration has been given individualized or programmed instruction;
6) Program outcomes or competencies have not been identified.

Certainly one of the most important factors in student mobility is an "instructional program" including the following elements: program placement; developmental program; instructional methods and models; curriculum development; assessment of experiential learning; follow-up evaluation; and cooperative education.

Program Placements

We mentioned placement in programs from the student's point-of-view. One

aspect not mentioned was limited access programs in colleges and universities which obviously affect student mobility--students are selected "out" of these programs. We may have no choice in placing limitations on admission to certain programs because of demand for the training or limited placement opportunities. However, criteria used in limited access programs should be examined to determine if they allow equal chance of entry for all groups seeking admission. For example, in one of our limited access programs in Florida criteria was set to determine which students would most likely be successful in the program. The admissions committee selected only students at the "top" of the list in grades and test scores. No minority student was selected even though it was determined that a number of minorities had applied who could have been successful in the program--they just didn't happen to appear in the top "10." The process for selection to limited access programs should be reviewed so that there is not unjustifiable discrimination.

Developmental Programs

Developmental programs may make THE significant difference in lateral mobility for students. It may not be an exaggeration to say that faculty attitude is the biggest factor in student success--and, therefore, student mobility—in the area of developmental studies. Without specific training or demonstrated aptitude, many teachers have less than positive attitudes, and the students--already accustomed to failure and with lack of motivation and self-confidence--react predictably.

This type of nontraditional student needs a nurturing but realistic

environment, and he needs teachers who work with him as a human being who has potential--teachers who know how to take him from wherever he is and move him onward in a positive, growth-producing manner. This type of student flourishes in a block-scheduling situation, where small groups aiming toward building self-knowledge and self-concept combine with structured reading, communication skills, and math lab programs. Faculty in developmental study programs first need to be available for close, fairly dependent learning sessions and to move students along toward more self-directed learning techniques. Honest praise and honest correction set a realistic atmosphere.

Realistic questions to ask on-campus might be: (1) What priority has our college given to developmental studies? (2) How closely do our faculty and counselors work together in such a program? (3) Are teachers assigned who want to work with these students? (4) Have we designed non-punitive grading and time-free entrance-exit plans for developmental studies? (5) Do we give credit for these courses? (6) Can competency-based courses help us keep our standards?

Many colleges have designed policies that allow students to enter a program, complete modules at their own pace and, if not finished by the end of the term, to withdraw up to the last day without penalty. Then when the students enroll next term, they pay tuition again, but they pick up their work on whatever module they were on, and move to completion. Thus, standards are kept high, but the students do gain credit. This plan provides motivation for the students, and learning theorists insist that this is a most important factor.

Instructional Models and Methods

As suggested in discussing developmental programs, there are numerous instructional models and methods that can facilitate student mobility. Probably the most important aspect to consider in helping students move laterally and vertically is the determination of outcomes or competencies that are expected of students who complete programs. Stated outcomes or competencies help students in making program selections, and in understanding what will be expected of them when they complete the program; a student will generally learn better in a classroom setting where he knows what is expected of him and to what extent he is meeting these expectations. Stated program outcomes facilitate students' movement from program to program, either laterally or vertically. Curriculum modification can be aided through follow-up evaluation of students' performance related to these outcomes. The process of identifying program outcomes also contributes to the process of assessing prior learning.

Identifying program outcomes or competencies is an essential part of a competency-based program. Many colleges aided by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and other similar agencies and foundations have done extensive study of competency-based education or development of a "Competency-based Curriculum." Colleges, such as Mars Hill in Mars Hill, North Carolina and Alverno College in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, have defined a competency-based curriculum in the liberal arts. Alverno has defined competencies, such as develop effective communication skills, sharpen analytical capabilities, develop workable problem-solving skills, develop a facility for

for making value judgments and independent decisions, and develop facility for social interaction. Six levels are listed under each of these competencies. With demonstrated achievement in any one of these levels the student receives one competence level unit (CLU). An Associate of Arts degree is awarded when the first four levels of each of the eight competencies have been demonstrated. For a bachelor's degree, in addition to these 32 CLU's, the student must achieve another eight CLU's, at least one of them to be at level six. In general, higher levels of any given competence will require more time and effort to achieve than will the lower ones.

Many vocational programs are already competency-based and have been for a number of years. The Vocational-Educational Consortium of the States (VTECS), with Southern Association as its sponsoring agency, is concerned with the development of catalogs of competencies of various occupations as identified by the 18 member states. North Carolina has a competency-based project that is involved in competency-based curriculum development for approximately 35 different curriculums.

Some additional sources to assist in competency identification are:

A search of the ERIC systems for journal articles and related information;

Inquiries to the U. S. Office of Education, National Center for Curriculum Development in Occupational Education;

Review of the Dissertation Abstract International Index;

Inquiries to program graduates, employers, and employees with the occupation;

Inquiries to agencies such as the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education;

Inquiries to business, professional, and industrial specialists;

A search of task inventories catalogs for the Task Inventory Exchange Clearinghouse.

Other instructional models and methods should be considered in order to facilitate student mobility.

Contract learning refers to the development of a contract between the student and instructor (or committee) by determining program (or course) outcomes or competencies, designing strategies for accomplishing these outcomes and agreeing on methods of measuring outcomes. This is usually done on an individual basis.

Mastery learning is related to behaviorist theory. It can be employed humanistically. It consists of several elements: clearly expressed objectives or competencies; modules of work that intertwine to produce desired results step-by-step; (It is said that 90 percent of the students should be able to learn 90 percent of the material 90 percent of the time.) relevant learning materials and experiences; and follow-up evaluation before proceeding to the next module.

This has been found to be very effective as one alternative in the teaching-learning environment. Here again, the teacher is a key factor. Many students lack experience in self-directed learning,

so the instructor should expect to lend a hand at first to assist the student toward a successful experience. It can be carried out as a class or by one individual.

Individualized instruction is an effort to adapt a course to the learning rates of students by developing each unit of the course on an individual basis. These modules become self-contained instructional packages dealing with a small amount of subject matter which form a conceptual whole, capable of "standing alone." The student can proceed independently through each unit. Often the material is transportable so that the student can choose a time and a place to learn.

Computer interaction is also individualized instruction in which the student interacts with a computer in order to learn. Systems, such as the SIGI system from Educational Testing Services, have been developed for career development programs.

Non-traditional formats, such as educational television, newspaper courses and the open college/university, can give flexibility to programs that aid students in program completion and mobility.

Traditional methods of instruction should not be overlooked as appropriate for aiding in student mobility. Students, particularly older students, often feel more comfortable with traditional methods, such as lectures, seminars and traditional laboratories.

Evaluation of student learning is essential to sound instructional development. Relating evaluation measures to program or course outcomes provides for criterion-referenced evaluation. Criterion-referenced evaluation is replacing traditional norm-referenced approaches when measurement of student learning is the purpose of evaluation.

Curriculum Development

A simple way of looking at curriculum development is in four stages--

1) Definition of objectives;
2) Selection of objectives;
3) Organization of experiences;
4) Evaluation.

As program and course objectives (program/course outcomes) are defined, consideration should be given to community needs and student goals. Curriculum content goals and student goals should be considered equally in selection of course or program objectives. The next step in curriculum development is the organization of experiences to meet the selected course or program objectives. Student learning styles and faculty teaching styles related to the "organizing experiences" in curriculum development have already been discussed. Curriculum evaluation will be addressed when we discuss follow-up evaluation.

Assessment of Experiential Learning

Assessment of experiential learning can contribute substantially to a

student's progress--through programs, from program to program, or from institution to institution. Through such mechanisms as CLEP, or institutional exams, a student can receive credit when he changes programs or moves from one institution to another. The Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning, (CAEL) is a major resource in assessment of experiential learning. CAEL started as a cooperative project between Educational Testing Service and 10 task force institutions to develop appropriate concepts, methods, procedures, techniques, and instruments for the assessment of experiential learning and to validate such ideas, processes, and materials through large scale tryout on many college campuses. During CAEL's first year, there was the effort to clarify ideas about the nature and value of experiential learning and about ways to improve the quality and the adaptability of available assessment processes. CAEL now is emphasizing two major projects:

Faculty development;

Generating operational models for incorporating experiential learning into an institution.

CAEL has identified six stages of the assessment of the experiential learning process:

1) The identification of college-creditable competencies;
2) Articulation of experiential learning to student's academic programs;
3) Documentation of learning outcomes;
4) Measurement of the level of competency acquired;
5) Evaluation of the outcomes for possible credit;
6) Recording the learning outcomes in the student's transcript.

More information can be obtained by contacting CAEL, American City Building, Suite 208, Columbia, Maryland, 21044, 301/997-3535.

Follow-Up Evaluation

Follow-up evaluation is a method of determining the effectiveness of a program of instruction by questioning former students who have completed the program, students who withdraw, employers and college faculty. It is a process by which institutional personnel can determine if their students are being adequately prepared to do what is necessary to perform on the job or at the upper level of college training. Follow-up evaluation can provide a guide for making necessary modifications that will help retain students in programs and move students vertically and laterally.

Cooperative Education

Some community colleges make provision for limited credit for on-the-job or cooperative education experiences under certain well-defined conditions. For some students the experience is also a maturing factor which may enable the student to review career goals and to modify his course program accordingly. In this respect cooperative education may contribute to student mobility, particularly in the non-transfer fields. The offering of mini-courses may also serve the purpose of providing exploratory experiences for students who have not settled firmly upon a career choice.

THE INSTITUTION

The role of instructional affairs in student mobility as it relates to

the institution concerns needs assessment, mission, philosophy, facilities, and policies.

Needs assessment relates to the examination of community needs so as to determine the appropriateness of courses or programs. Community needs give direction to development of program and support services. The institution should have a stated commitment to student mobility as a part of the instructional philosophy. The mission and objectives of the institution should reflect such a commitment. Facilities should be flexible, creating an environment that students will see as "open." Facilities for individualized instruction and other non-traditional modes of instruction should be available.

The objective of achieving lateral and vertical mobility for students in postsecondary institutions justifies an institution in examining its policies and regulations in terms of their impact upon the mobility factor.

1) Academic regulations should provide for lateral mobility with minimal loss of credit through penalties on change of program.
2) Probation and suspension should have provisions to encourage transfer, when justified, from one curriculum to another as an option to dropping out of school.
3) Students are most likely to succeed in colleges where policies and programs are developed and implemented by the active participation of all college personnel and by lay people and representatives of community services.

4) Lateral mobility is most flexible where the original and final objectives of the student are both transfer oriented. Vocational and technical curricula should be planned to include as many general education courses as possible consistent with the objectives of the programs. It is suggested that efforts be made to provide for at least 25 percent of vocational programs to be in the general education areas.

5) Mobility is enhanced if grading concentrates upon competencies learned or possessed rather than upon normative grading systems in those fields where competencies are the educational goals. Policy should reflect this grading practice.

6) Policies relating to credit for experience and by examination should be clearly formulated and made visible.

7) Clearly formulated and published relationships with other institutions on transfer of credit and articulation are of the highest importance. Special arrangements for articulated and interfaced occupational and specialized degree programs should be developed and clearly stated. There should be jointly planned degree-ladder programs. Shared resources between institutions as well as shared faculty may enhance vertical mobility.

8) Articulation agreements are important with four-year colleges but also with technical institutions and with vocational programs in secondary schools. North Carolina has shown real leadership in this area.

THE STATE

The last area to be examined in the instructional role in student mobility is the state. State agencies related to public colleges and universities vary in the amount of influence they have upon the formation of policies and the definition of procedures. In some cases their impact is limited to exerting influence and leadership; in other states these agencies may have authority over certain designated policy matters. In either case the state agencies may exercise leadership in promoting actions which will enhance student mobility.

1) State agency personnel have the opportunity to influence the development of state laws and regulations, state accreditation standards, accountability standards, and other policies and procedures related to student mobility.

2) In its monitoring of college practices in such areas as equal access and equal opportunity, the state agency can identify and disseminate exemplary practices which contribute to mobility.

3) State agency personnel can encourage coordinated review of articulation mechanisms statewide with the goal of improving student movement between community colleges and senior institutions and between community colleges and technical institutes.

4) State agencies can organize statewide workshops on student mobility and provide consultants to assist institutions in implementing policies and practices which improve the mobility factor. North Carolina is the first state to do this.

5) State agencies can make studies of the impact which the modification of state regulations will have upon sound educational practice as well as upon improving student mobility.

Finally, administration should take leadership in involving faculty, counselors, and other appropriate personnel in meeting the needs of students as related to student mobility. Too often faculty address one part of the problem--the curriculum, while administrators formulate instructional policy and counselors work with students in setting or reassessing goals. These activities may be done in isolation without adequate communication or joint effort. Student mobility might be greatly enhanced if a team approach was taken in solving student and institutional mobility problems.

CONCLUSION

The provision of mechanism/strategies for providing for lateral and vertical mobility has been accepted by postsecondary education as an essential function which will be fulfilled. The basic question is whether or not we are really fulfilling this function on the campus. As we review each of the areas relating to the role of instructional affairs in student mobility--the student, faculty, programs, the institution, the state—there are components in each of these areas that we can point to and say--Yes, we are really making progress in helping students identify goals, in assessing prior learning, in articulating programs, etc. The questions remain then "What is not getting done at my institution or at the state level to provide for student mobility?

What are we personally doing to build barriers that prohibit students from moving laterally and vertically? How can my institution improve its capability to provide for maximum student mobility?" You may want to address these questions in your discussion group, or when you return home to assess where you are in providing mechanisms in the instructional area for student mobility.

I might say in closing--that student mobility in a college is dependent upon a continuity of services to students which begin before they enroll and which extend beyond their departure from the campus. These services must extend beyond theory; they must be a practical reality on the campus if student mobility is to be achieved.

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

The evaluation questionnaire was designed so that the responses from the participants would be most effective for planning continuing workshops. Responses, which are reported in percentages, were submitted by approximately eighty-two percent of the participants who remained in attendance throughout the proceedings.

I. Background Data. Please check the category which applies to you.

A. Position:

30.6 Administrator

54.6 Faculty Member

14.8 Other Staff

B. Institutional Status:

82.8 Two-year Institution

17.2 Senior Institution

C. Work Group:

48.6 A

51.4 B

II. Workshop Format.

What are your opinions about these particular aspects of the workshop format?

	Overall Scheduling	Consultant Presentations	Working Group Sessions
A. Workshop program structure.			
Too unstructured	0	3.4	17.8
About right	98.6	94.0	82.2
Too structured	1.4	2.6	0
B. Pace			
Too slow	7.5	4.8	16.8
About right	92.5	95.2	83.2
Too fast	0	0	0
C. Length			
Too short (needed more time)	9.1	2.3	32.7
About right	89.0	96.4	67.3
Too long	1.9	1.3	0
D. Content			
Too general & superficial	14.2	26.4	38.7
About right	85.8	73.6	61.3
Too specific & detailed	0	0	0

III. Workshop Consultants.

A. How would you generally rate the workshop consultants on the following dimensions?

	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
1. Proficient in content area	2.4	6.4	13.6	59.4	18.2
2. Ability to communicate ideas	1.9	5.3	21.6	61.2	10.0
3. Able to relate presentation to practice	4.3	12.6	31.2	29.8	18.3
4. Understanding of your concerns and problems	9.3	19.6	29.7	41.2	17.4
5. Interest in helping you and other participants	2.3	8.5	31.2	38.4	19.6

B. How would you rate the effectiveness of workshop consultant presentations in relation to your needs and interests?

18.4 Contributed strongly

56.7 Contributed moderately

23.5 Contributed slightly

1.4 Not relevant

IV. Work Group Sessions.

How would you rate the effectiveness of participation in your work groups in relation to the consideration of the workshop theme?

28.4 Contributed strongly

48.3 Contributed moderately

19.5 Contributed slightly

3.8 Not relevant

V. Would you recommend a workshop like this to other administrators, faculty, staff, and/or lay board members?

1.4 No

29.3 Yes, with reservations

69.3 Yes, with no reservations

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 29

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES